

THE HISTORICAL POSITION  
OF  
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

FRANCIS J. HALL

12.14.98.  
Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 5930 .H24 1895  
Hall, Francis J. 1857-1932.  
The historical position of  
the Episcopal Church

Shelf \_\_\_\_\_





THE HISTORICAL POSITION  
OF  
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

A Paper

READ BY THE  
REV. FRANCIS J. HALL, M.A.,  
INSTRUCTOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE WESTERN THEOLOGICAL  
SEMINARY, CHICAGO,  
BEFORE THE  
CHURCH HISTORY CLUB OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL (BAPTIST),  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, DECEMBER 11,  
1894; AND BEFORE THE CHICAGO CLERICUS  
(EPISCOPAL), DECEMBER 17, 1894.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE  
CHICAGO CLERICUS.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.:  
THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.  
1895.

COPYRIGHT SECURED BY THE AUTHOR.

DEDICATED. BY PERMISSION,  
TO THE  
REV. ERI B. HULBERT, D.D.,  
DEAN OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CHICAGO, WHOSE  
COURTESY, HEREBY SHOWN, IS THE MORE  
NOTEWORTHY BY REASON  
OF THE  
DIFFERENCES OF CONVICTION  
BETWEEN US.



WHAT DOES THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH  
CLAIM TO STAND FOR IN HISTORY ?

It is with heartfelt pleasure that I accept the courteous invitation which you have given me to read a paper before this Club, and I appreciate your kindness the more because I understand that you expect me to address you from the point of view of an Episcopalian. It is not to be expected that a Club like this will agree with all the beliefs which are likely to be propounded by one who speaks from such a point of view.

Yet, if I rightly understand your invitation, I am expected to speak with entire candour. Gentlemen, I appreciate your kindness and accept your invitation in good faith. I shall, therefore, not shrink from plain speech, even when touching upon the things wherein we differ, although, in speaking plainly, I trust that I shall not abuse your kindness by any manner of utterance inconsistent with the Christian duty of speaking the truth in love. The truth, my friends, is sacred—not less so

when ascertained than when still being sought after—and should enslave our hearts, and minds, and tongues. Truth is mighty and, in the end, will prevail; so that, if we would think to some purpose, and contribute to the permanent advance of spiritual intelligence and life, we must conform our thoughts and language to the truth, as such. Moreover, the principle of love to which I have referred requires not only that we should conform to the truth *when* we speak, but that we *should* speak—openly and persistently—in the presence of those who are still lacking such truth as we have learned, until it has become the common possession of mankind. I am sure that you agree with me here, and that you expect me to conform my utterances to what I, an Episcopalian, am convinced to be the truth, without reserve or fear of causing offence.

I purpose this evening to answer, as well as I can, this question: *What does the Episcopal Church claim to stand for in history?*

My aim is chiefly expository, and I shall endeavour to avoid a polemical tone: although I cannot promise to assume the indifferent tone of one who has no interest in the questions at

issue. I am sure you do not expect this. I shall deal with arguments, but in their historical aspects, and for the purpose of exhibiting more clearly the nature of the Episcopal position, and of obviating certain misapprehensions concerning it.

To enter at once *in medias res*, The Episcopal Church claims to stand in history for three things: (a) for the original of the Christian religion; (b) for that which it has, as a matter of history, received in trust, and therefore may not lawfully compromise or surrender; (c) for the only possible basis of Church Unity.

## I.

In the first place, then, *the Episcopal Church claims to stand for the original of the Christian Religion.*

The true idea of religion, as it appears in history—and Sacred History is none the less history, because it is given chiefly in the Bible—is that of a bond or covenant between God and man; along with whatever pertains to such a covenant, of truth, institutions and life. It is thus, I am sure, that Sacred as well as Eccle-

siastical history exhibits religion to us. The Greek word *διαθήκη*, which is usually translated testament, is more accurately translated covenant; and the entire Bible is concerned with the Old Covenant or Hebrew Religion, and the New Covenant or Christian Religion. This does not mean that these two are different religions, but that they are two dispensations of one and the same religion, which are necessarily in harmony with each other and governed in common by certain principles which are permanent and unalterable, since they proceed from one God, with Whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning<sup>1</sup>. The law is a schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ<sup>2</sup>; and, as S. Augustine said long ago, the New Testament is latent in the Old, and the Old is unveiled in the New<sup>3</sup>. It is, therefore, a mistake to oppose one dispensation to the other, for they are but successive Divine arrangements in one covenant of promise made of old with the patriarchs. The Christian dispensation is indeed more spiritual, but this does not mean that the old religion has been revolutionized, so as to become indeterminate, unrecognizable

1. S. Jas. I. 17.    2. Gal. III. 24.    3. Quest. in Ex. Q. 73.

and without visible ministries or means of open maintenance before the world and of corporate life. It means rather that the inner and spiritual significance of God's covenant has been unveiled in its fulfilment by Christ; and that, in consequence of Christ's work and ordinance, the ancient forms, which were without power<sup>1</sup>, have been reconstituted and given spiritual *efficacy* and world-wide application. The religion of Christ is the religion of Abraham and of Moses; and, like its Author, is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever<sup>2</sup>.

If this original and everlasting religion of God is to be identified, it must be by means of such characteristics as were of Divine origin in the beginning, and which have been permanent, being provided for by God in every successive dispensation. I think that three such characteristics can be distinguished historically without difficulty. I will try to exhibit them in due order.

(a) The first of them, appearing in both the Hebrew and Christian dispensations, and, therefore, characterizing the original Christian relig-

1. Heb. VIII. 7-13: X. 1, 11.

2. Heb. XIII. 8.

ion, is the existence of *one visible organism*<sup>1</sup> or chosen people, with whom the Covenant is made, and which possesses a determinate organization or *Ministry of Divine origin*, ordained for the publication and continual maintenance of the Covenant.

The subject of the Divine covenants is referred to in a multitude of passages in both portions of Holy Scripture, but nowhere do we find that the human party thereto is an individual soul as such. The Hebrew Covenant was made with Abraham and his seed forever<sup>2</sup>—not with Abraham in isolation from his seed—and the New Covenant is but a continuation of the Old in a more effectual and Catholic dispensation<sup>3</sup>. The human party to the covenant is still the seed of Abraham, but a *sacramental* seed, buried by Baptism in Christ, Who is at once the seed of Abraham and the Son of God, the one Mediator between God and man<sup>4</sup>. The seed which was Jewish and had Circumcision for its sign, becomes Christian (without loss of

1. See App. I.

2. Gen. XVII, 7; S. Luke I, 55.

3. Gen. XXIII, 18; Isaiah LIV, 1-3; LVI, 3-7; Jerem. XXXI, 31-34; Mal. I, 11.

4. Gal. III, 16, 27-29; S. Luke III, 8; I. Tim. II, 5.

continuity) and has Baptism for its sign<sup>1</sup>. The original chosen people is merged into the Christian Church ; which is the Body of Christ<sup>3</sup>, and to which all individual souls are added daily by Baptism who are being saved by God . In short the ancient Covenant has now for its human party the Church of Christ, and for its covenanted beneficiaries all those who are baptized into that Church and conform therein to the terms of the Covenant.

It might naturally have been anticipated that when God called His chosen and made them a peculiar people, He would ordain some visible organization of that people for the sure maintenance of the Covenant and an abiding evidence of its continuance. The Episcopal Church contends that He did this; and we regard the patriarchal, the Aaronic, and the Episcopal Ministries as the successive centres of the organizations into which God Himself has moulded His chosen race. It was God who formed the earthly society with which He made His Covenant<sup>5</sup>; and therefore it was God who determined for each successive dispensation in what

1. Gen. XVII. 9-11; Heb. X. 16, 22.

2. Ephes. II. 11-22.

3. Ephes. I. 22, 23; V. 28-30; Ac's XII. 27.

4. Acts II. 47.

5. Isaiah XLIII. 1, 21; XLIV. 2; S. Matt. XVI. 18.

manner and by what sort of Ministry it should perform the corporate terms of the Covenant. God has altered the form of this Ministry in each succeeding dispensation. But He has never surrendered the prerogative of making such alterations Himself<sup>1</sup>.

Accordingly, our Lord Jesus Christ instituted a perpetual Ministry for His church, which He built upon the Apostles and Prophets with Himself for its chief Corner Stone, to rest upon that foundation through all time<sup>2</sup>. And, as Clement of Rome says, writing four or five years before the death of S. John the Divine, "Our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the Bishop's office. For this cause therefore, having received complete foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons, and afterward they provided a continuance, that if these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministration<sup>3</sup>."

Examples of this action of the Apostles may be seen in Timothy, appointed over the Church of Ephesus, and Titus, appointed over that of

1. Heb. VII. 11-28; Numb. XVI.

2. S. John XX. 21; Acts XII. 28; Ephes. II, 20-22; Heb. V. 4.

3. Clem. ad Cor. c. 44, Lightfoot's transl.

Crete; and it is immaterial to our contention whether the first successors of the Apostles were called Bishops, or Presbyters, or both. What we claim is, that, in any case, the Apostolic Ministry was *transmitted*, and that no one can now exercise that ministry lawfully except those who have received the authority to do so by actual and unbroken transmission from the Apostles, who were originally appointed and ordained by Jesus Christ. This is the Apostolic Succession; and the phrase "Historic Episcopate" is used because we are sure that, as a matter of history, what is now called the Episcopate, and still possessed by three-fourths of the Christian world, is the identical Ministry which the Apostles ordained, in accordance with the Commission of Christ, to perpetuate their own Ministry, for the benefit of future generations, until the end of the world.

I do not, of course, mean that *all* the powers of the Apostles were handed on, but the powers of the *Ministry*, of *that* Ministry which Christ promised to be with to the end of days, of which they were the first trustees. Their miraculous powers, as distinguished from those strictly Ministerial, were, of course, an accident

of their time and of their unique work of laying foundations; and it is worthy of note that such powers were not, as in case of their Ministerial ones, confined to those ordained to the Ministry<sup>1</sup>.

The limitations under which I speak forbid that I should exhibit in detail the large body of historical argument by which this position is sustained<sup>2</sup>. I must content myself with saying, first, that Ignatius of Antioch, writing, as Lightfoot contends, about ten years after the death of S. John<sup>3</sup>, identifies the successors of the Apostles with the *Episcopoi* then ruling the Church<sup>4</sup>, and asserts that no ecclesiastical organism was complete without them<sup>5</sup>. No careful student will hesitate to agree that the order to which he referred under the name *Episcopoi* is historically one with that now called by the same name. Moreover, complete lists of the successors of the Apostles in certain Apostolic sees, acknowledged in their day to be the Divinely ordained means by which the Apostolic Ministry was to be perpetuated, are preserved in the writings of S. Irenæus and

1. Acts XXI. 9; I Cor. XII. 23-30.

2. See App. I.

3. Apos. Fathers, Part II., Vol 1. 30.

4. Ad Philad. Introd., etc.

5. Ad Tral. 3.

others<sup>1</sup>. It is easy to show historically that these lines are but the earlier trunks of the many branches of Episcopal succession, now existing throughout the Catholic Church. Finally it is a fact, clear to the most superficial student of Church history, that it was not the custom in the ages preceding the Reformation to confer Apostolic authority on any save those who were named Bishops. Therefore if there is an Apostolic succession such as I have defined, the Historic Episcopate alone possesses it.

(b) A second original and permanent note of true religion is *the possession by God's chosen people of a traditional body of truth*, revealed by God and intrusted to its Ministry to be preserved from generation to generation, for the guidance of all who are called of God to share in the benefits of His Covenant. In ancient times God gave Israel a law which He commanded our spiritual "forefathers to teach their children, that their posterity might know it, and the children which were yet unborn, to the intent that when they came up, they might

1. cf. Gore on the Ministry, ch. III,

show their children the same<sup>1</sup>." And, in the fulness of time, our Lord fulfilled this law, revealed the principles of truth and righteousness which lay behind it, and commissioned His Apostles to disciple all nations, promising that He would be with them in this work until the end of the world<sup>2</sup>, and that the Holy Ghost should guide them into all truth<sup>3</sup>. This promise, because of its perpetual nature, applies to the successors of the Apostles. We are commanded to hear the Church<sup>4</sup>, and are told by S. Paul that the Church is the pillar and ground of the truth<sup>5</sup>. Against this Church the gates of hell are not to prevail<sup>6</sup>, whatever individual unfaithfulness may be displayed at times by some, or many, or even by a majority of its Ministers.

It is not claimed that the earthly portion of the Catholic Church succeeds in making the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints so clear as to be unmistakable by any, nor that

1. Psa. LXXVIII. 5-7. Prayer Book Version: cf. S. Matt. XXIII. 2, 3.

2. S. Matt. XXVIII. 19, 20; X. 23.

3. S. John XIV. 26; XVI. 13, 14.

4. S. Matt. X. 40; XVIII. 17 (cf. XXIII. 2, 3).

5. I. Tim. III. 15.

6. S. Matt. XVI. 18.

the Church can answer every speculative question which the progress of science may suggest. That would indeed be a claim both unhistoric and unreasonable. God *nowhere on earth* so unveils the truth that we may perceive its contents without effort or liability to err<sup>1</sup>. Certainly, if the doctrinal differences between Protestant denominations mean anything, He does not do this by means of the Bible only, in isolation from the Church whose Canon of Scripture it is.

No, my friends, what we claim is, that God has, as a matter of history, made His Apostolic Church and Ministry the perpetual means of so preserving His saving truth in the world, that no one who fully conforms to the terms of the New Covenant as published and fulfilled by her—*i. e.*, gives implicit assent to those Creeds which have her *undivided and corporate sanction*, devoutly studies the Bible which she furnishes as God's Word from *her point of view*, and heartily enters into the privileges of her sacramental life and environment—can fail to attain to the knowledge of such truth as is needed for his advance in holiness and his

1. I. Cor. XIII. 8-12.

eternal glory hereafter. We claim further, that such security neither exists nor can exist elsewhere in the world. The One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, with its Divine and therefore unalterable Ministry, now called Episcopal, is the only thing on earth which Holy Scripture calls the pillar and ground of the truth, and which has Christ's solemn pledge of infallibility<sup>1</sup>. Individuals may err, Bishops may err, councils may err<sup>2</sup>; but, if they do, the abiding life and institutions of the Church make it clear to the faithful, ere long, that such errors do not represent her mind. That mind is organic and can neither be altered nor permanently changed by majorities or passing schools of thought.

I do not forget that I am concerned with what is historic rather than with what is theoretical, and therefore call your attention to two significant facts, in order to make clear what I mean. The first of these is the fact that neither any individual nor any school of thought has ever changed or added to the faith of the Catholic Church. An Athanasius

1. I. Tim. III. 15; S. Matt. XVI. 18.

2. 39 Arts. XXI., Eng. Prayer Book,

and a Cyril in the East, an Augustine and a Leo in the West, a Hooker and a Pusey in the Anglican Communion, may have done much to vindicate certain ancient doctrines. But no theologian or school has been able to impose new doctrines upon either of the portions of the Catholic Church which I have mentioned, or modify Catholic teaching. The Lutherans appeal to Luther and Melancthon, the Calvinists to John Calvin, the Methodists to John Wesley. We appeal simply to the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints, as contained in the Scriptures, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed general councils<sup>1</sup>.

The second fact is the unity of faith which has prevailed and continues to exist throughout the Catholic Church. The controversies which have separated the Greek, Latin, and Anglican communions for so many ages are indeed deplorable; but their very seriousness is our reason for marvelling at the range of agreement in Faith, which has survived them all, and for believing it to be superhuman. The Greek regards the insertion of the *filioque* into the Nicene Creed as unlawful, and misconceives

1. Lambeth Conference, 1878, Introd. to Resolutions.

its meaning; but the doctrine which that phrase is really designed to protect is held in the East as well as in the West. The Anglican complains of the exaggerated claims of the Roman see, and of the modern theories and superstitious abuses which are cherished under the Roman obedience; but he perceives with thankfulness that, however much the Romanist may have surrounded it with inferior matter, he still cherishes in its fulness that original Faith which Anglicans cherish and for which the ancient martyrs died. Alienation exists, anathemas have been pronounced—although the Anglican Communion has hurled none—frightful misconceptions prevail, the differences in circumstances are radical; yet, in every land and in every language, Catholic Christendom holds the same Faith, cherishes one sacramental system and one sacerdotal Ministry, approaches the Almighty with one liturgic service and unbloody Sacrifice, which is everywhere the same in its constituent parts and meaning, whatever variations of phraseology may be employed. The sun sets not upon those who hold the Catholic Faith in its entirety. We believe that a unity like this, sur-

viving, as it has, the loss of charity, is beyond man's power of achievement; and that it is the fulfilment of Christ's promise to be with His Apostolic Ministry to the end of days.

No such unity exists elsewhere, certainly not in the Protestant world. The Protestant denominations exchange polite speeches. There are Evangelical Alliances, interchanges of pulpits, Y. M. C. A.s, societies of Christian Endeavour, etc. But, with every effort to minimize differences, the Protestant world does differ radically as to those primary verities and ministries of grace with which the Christian religion began to be. It has been pointed out that each doctrine of the Faith once for all delivered is denied by some Protestant body, and that that thing which Protestants call "our common Christianity" is absolutely undefinable—a vanishing point. Even what Mr. Gladstone has recently called the essence of Christianity—the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation<sup>1</sup>—is being dissolved in many directions under the miasmatic influence of rationalism, and a thinly disguised Pantheism, which can subscribe to Christian formularies in pagan

1. *Nineteenth Century*, Aug. 1894.

senses. The present Socinian body in England is the same with the original Presbyterian denomination in that country. Multitudes of Protestants are losing faith in the Old Testament, especially in the presence of Higher Criticism, and few Protestants feel at home in the Old Testament or have any large use for it<sup>1</sup>. "The down-grade of Protestantism" is too apparent to escape notice, as the late Mr. Spurgeon recognized to his grief. These facts — Catholic consent and disagreement elsewhere — convince us that what is nicknamed "ecclesiasticism," and misunderstood by many because of that misleading phrase, is the primary historical means whereby God wills to preserve His truth in the world and save the souls whom Christ has redeemed.

(c) The third original and permanent characteristic of the Divine Covenants and of true religion is the maintenance among the chosen people of *certain visible rites ordained of God*<sup>2</sup> — especially the rites of admission to the chosen people and Covenant, and those of corporate approach to God and communion with Him.

1. See App. II.

2. See App. I.

Thus Circumcision and Baptism are the respective rites by which God ordained that men should be admitted into the Jewish and Christian Covenants. They are for that reason correlative. This is shown conclusively in the Epistle to the Colossians, second chapter<sup>1</sup>, and the whole argument of the Epistle to the Galatians shows the same truth, in which the leading thought is that, whereas in the Old Covenant Circumcision was necessary for initiation, "in Christ Jesus neither Circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature<sup>2</sup>"—a plain allusion to the new birth of water and of the Spirit, mentioned by Christ to Nicodemus as necessary for entrance into His Kingdom<sup>3</sup>. Circumcision signified those who were of Abraham's seed. Baptism makes us also of that seed by our putting on Christ<sup>4</sup>; and a new life is thus imparted to us which, if fostered, will finally abolish the whole body of sin. Thus the accompanying effects of Baptism exceed those of Circumcision, which was only a sign. Yet, while Baptism causes an internal and organic relation between the soul and Christ's body<sup>5</sup>, and is an instru-

1. Col. II. 11, 12.

2. Gal. VI. 15.

3. S. John III. 5.

4. Gal. III. 24-29; Col. II. 11, 12.

5. Ephes. V. 26, 30.

ment by means of which the Holy Ghost puts us in a *state of grace and salvation* and *begins* His sanctifying operations in us; it is neither the means nor the sign of completed salvation.

Both rites, being initiatory, were ordained for children. Every Hebrew boy was circumcised when eight days old, and Christ significantly declared concerning little children that of such—*i. e.*, of such sources—is the Kingdom of Heaven. The idea that He meant that little children are members of the Kingdom of Heaven *by nature* is distinctly modern.

The new Testament, when isolated from the historic institutions and usages of that Kingdom of God which put it forth, and treated as if it were in itself a complete thesaurus of formulated answers to all religious questions, has of course a different meaning from what it has when regarded in its ancient light as the Church's Canon of Scripture, set forth by her as inspired by the same Spirit who was guiding her Apostolic Ministry into all truth, in order that it might strengthen the hold of the faithful upon that body of truth which they had received through her.

When the Church began to settle her Canon,

in ante-Nicene days, she was baptizing infants; and the absence of any explicit mention of the circumstance in Holy Scripture signifies nothing, unless we are to assume unhistoric ground and make Holy Scripture the original and complete *source* of all the Church's usages. I have said that the Episcopal Church claims to stand for the original of the Christian Religion. That original antedates the New Testament Scriptures, and is only described in detail therein with reference to matters which had come into controversy or were liable to neglect.

The analogy of Circumcision, for which Baptism is the Christian correlative, creates a presumption in favor of infant Baptism, which can only be overcome by the discovery of its positive prohibition by God. Certainly no such prohibition is found in the New Testament. The requirement of faith and repentance before the Baptism of adult converts<sup>1</sup>—and no other such requirement can be proved from Holy Scripture—does not bear on the point in the slightest degree, for a similar requirement of conversion to the Jewish religion was made of adult applicants for Circumcision<sup>2</sup>. So that

1. Acts II. 38; VII, 36-38.

2. Rom. IV. 10, 11.

the argument which is used to justify an invariable postponement of Baptism until the years of discretion would have been equally available to justify a similar postponement of Circumcision. But such postponement was expressly forbidden by God<sup>1</sup>.

Our position would be better understood—and my whole argument is for the purpose of making our position more clear—if regeneration were not so often confounded with conversion. They are very different. Conversion is a change in our moral aims. Regeneration, which Baptism achieves, is the inauguration of a new, objective, vital and internal relation to Christ's Body, and does not necessarily coincide with conversion or signify that it has taken place. The Apostles naturally required that conversion should precede Baptism of *adults*, lest unbelief and unrepented acts of sin should make the reception of supernatural life both useless and dangerous. But no such barrier exists in the case of infants; and under ideal conditions infant Baptism frequently obviates the need of conversion by forestalling the growth of an anti-Christian disposition.

1. Gen. XVII. 12.

In addition to these initiatory rites, God instituted in each Covenant the visible manner in which and the means by which His chosen people were to approach Him with sacrificial homage or worship, and enter into Communion with Him. In the Mosaic Covenant three national Sacrifices were instituted, which were so many memorials beforehand, typifying in outline what Christ was to achieve in His great Sacrifice, consummated once for all on Calvary and perpetually offered in the Holy Place made without hands. These Sacrifices were ordained by God<sup>1</sup>. They were not actual means of grace, nor did they effect what they figured, but were none the less signs of what God promised that the Messiah should fulfil, in due season, for those who humbly offered them with faith<sup>2</sup>.

When Christ was about to suffer and fulfil these sacrificial promises so as to become our perpetual High Priest and Intercessor, He instituted one spiritual and effective rite which should occupy the same relative place in the dispensation of grace which was occupied by them in the Covenant of promise. I mean the Holy Eucharist. This rite signifies and

1. Levit. I-VII, XVI; Heb. IX.

2. Heb. IX. 6-14; X. 1-18.

enables its participants to join in the offering up of that full, perfect and sufficient Sacrifice which Christ achieved once for all on Calvary, but is offering forever in heaven on our behalf<sup>1</sup>. And it effects what the rites which it displaces only figured, for by means of it we truly unite under earthly conditions with what Christ is doing in heaven, and offer that pure offering which Malachi predicted would be offered throughout the gentile world<sup>2</sup>. The Eucharistic bread and wine, as Justin Martyr said in the middle of the second century, "we do not receive as common bread and common drink, . . . but have been taught that the food which has been blessed by the prayer of His Word . . . is the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Who was made Flesh<sup>3</sup>." Thus we offer up Jesus Christ Himself, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world but now alive forevermore<sup>4</sup>, feeding at the same time on the Bread which came down from heaven, in accordance with the words of Christ, Who said "except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood ye have no life in you<sup>5</sup>." Thus the Holy Eucharist is our

1. Heb. IX. 24-28.

2. Mal. I. 11.

3. S. Justin M., I. Apol. c. 66.

4. Rom. VI. 9, 10; Rev. XIII. 8.

5. S. John. VI. 50-58.

spiritual Sacrifice, whereby we participate in the one Sacrifice of Christ which can never be repeated or exhausted. It is not a repetition of the transaction of Calvary, but a memorial of it<sup>1</sup>—the same memorial which Christ is making in heaven, where He perpetually offers Himself and exhibits those glorious wounds which are the enduring evidence of His meritorious passion endured once for all<sup>2</sup>. Because the Holy Eucharist is a memorial and the offering up of a real gift—the living and impassible Body and Blood of Him who suffered—it is a true and proper Sacrifice, although only such because Christ is its Offerer and the thing offered<sup>3</sup>.

The Holy Eucharist is also our greatest Sacrament, by means of which we receive the benefits of Christ's death and "feed on Him in [our] hearts, by faith, with thanksgiving." It is the visible centre of Catholic life and unity; the Christian shekinah and place of our closest access to the Father through Christ; the ladder set up to heaven on earth—ordained as the means whereby we may take the fullest advantage

1. S. Luke XXII. 19; I Cor. XI. 24-26; Heb. IX. 24-26.

2. Rom. VIII. 34; I Tim. II. 5; Heb. VII. 24, 25; Zech. XIII. 6.

3. See App. I.

of Christ's Mediation and enter through the veil of His Flesh into the Holy Place<sup>1</sup>.

Yes, gentlemen, we claim ours to be the original Christian Religion--in fact the divinely instituted and divinely perfected religion of *all* the ages gone by; that which Patriarchs and Holy Prophets loved; that which God in Flesh obeyed, fulfilled and renewed with quickening power, but with unaltered and unalterable outlines and principles: that for which the Martyrs bled and the Fathers pleaded: which has persisted with unbroken life through every peril which Satan could devise; and which now reigns supreme in the hearts of countless multitudes of every nation, who obey Jesus Christ under one Apostolic Ministry, believe one universal Faith, and, in every tongue on earth, approach their God in one Eucharistic Sacrifice, "with Angels and Archangels and with all the Company of heaven evermore praising [Him] and saying Holy! Holy! Holy! Lord God of Hosts. Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Glory be to Thee O Lord most High. Amen."

1. Heb. X. 19, 20.

## II.

To pass on to the claim of the Episcopal Church to stand for *what is permanent in the Christian religion, which has been committed to the Apostolic Ministry in trust, and which therefore is "incapable of compromise or surrender."*

(a) A great deal has been said and written since our Bishops put forth their declaration on Church Unity in 1886, which is based upon a serious misinterpretation. This misinterpretation has arisen from isolating our terms of Unity from the body of the Declaration of which they are a part and which explains the sense in which they are submitted.

Thus, one of the most able of our own Clergy has persuaded himself and others that the phrase "Historic Episcopate" means the Episcopate as a historic fact merely, without reference to any doctrine whatever concerning it; and he urges this interpretation with the amiable but vain hope that, if Protestants can be persuaded that they are not asked to accept the Episcopate as Divinely ordained, or as having any necessary authority beyond what men concede to it<sup>1</sup>, they will at once submit

1. See App. III.

and swell the ranks of that prospective National Church which fills his imagination and kindles his aspirations. But any one can see that no denomination, however respectable, can consistently or without grave presumption, require as an ultimate term of Unity anything which it is not at the same time convinced is of Divine origin and requirement and, for that reason, unalterable by man. It is not surprising therefore, that many Protestants, misled by the interpretation to which I have referred, have criticised our attitude severely.

But an examination of the Bishops' Declaration itself is sufficient to clear us of the charge of inconsistency, whatever may be thought of the historical validity of our position.

As I have already stated, the terms in question are but a part of the Declaration on Unity. In that Declaration it is expressly claimed that the terms which are submitted are—to quote its own language—“inherent parts of a sacred deposit,” . . . “the substantial deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and therefore in-

capable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men<sup>1</sup>."

We do not therefore insist upon the Historic Episcopate as a venerable institution merely, nor because it is the Ministry most likely to be accepted by all, however true I shall show that to be, nor on any human ground whatever, but because Christ instituted it for all time, so that our only power in the matter is to exercise this Ministry for the benefit of the faithful and to transmit it without fail to succeeding ages. We cannot compromise or surrender it by entering into any scheme of union which is likely to result in its continuance and authority being made an open question.

The subtle distinction between what is essential to the being of the Church and what is essential to its well being is entirely irrelevant. We do not cling to the Episcopate on abstract but on *historic* grounds. It is historically of Divine origin, and has been committed to us as a sacred trust; and, therefore, is incapable of compromise or surrender.

1. General Convention Journal of 1886, p. 80.

Those who misunderstand us think that we are illiberal. We are not. Even if our claim is mistaken, it is honest and based upon the best historical evidence available. You do not consider a trustee liberal who surrenders what is committed to his keeping. You rather look upon him as dishonourable. You cannot, therefore, consistently ask the Episcopal Church to betray the Episcopal Ministry, so long as it thinks that that Ministry has been received in trust from God to be preserved through all generations. What our Declaration on Unity urges upon you is, that to secure Unity we must return to the ancient paths, by becoming loyal servants of what history shows to be the original Christian Religion; which, with its Apostolic Ministry, is God's Religion, founded for the common benefit of all generations of men; also, that our relationship to it is not one of ownership, but of *discipleship* and *trusteeship*. We urge you, in God's Name, to become its disciples also. We do not seek to absorb your *denominations*, but we want you, baptized brethren of the Catholic Church, to recognize your own spiritual Mother, and share with us in the blessings she imparts to her loyal chil-

dren and in her coming glory. We refuse to compromise or surrender—not what *we* own, but—what *God* owns, and has commanded us to preserve for you and for all others who may be called of God into the Unity of His Holy Catholic Church.

My brethren, we are not worthy of the trust which God has given us. The *Jews* were not intrusted with the Oracles of God because they were worthy<sup>1</sup>. So we cannot lay claim to any peculiar righteousness which fits us to bear the vessels of the Lord; but, recognizing that we are mere stewards who carry God's mercy in earthen vessels<sup>2</sup>, we call upon you, in God's Name, to come to the rescue with your zeal and piety, and share in the enjoyment and distribution of the blessings which a loving Father is asking you as well as ourselves to receive and distribute.

(*b*) God overrules the weakness of men. Through all the ages He has wrought spiritual marvels through those who were unworthy of the trust and ministry conferred upon them; and the Church with which He has thus dealt, has shown a power and energy in the midst of

1. Rom. II. 17—III. 9.

2. II Cor. IV. 7.

weakness which has often shut the mouths of her enemies.

Three centuries of persecution but multiplied her saints. Court policy and fundamental heresy, combined against her, simply enabled her to set forth the truths which were assailed, more clearly than ever, and in terms which can never become obsolete or cease to rally the faithful before the throne of God. Barbarian inroads but gave new masses of humanity for her to leaven. The Papacy itself gave prestige to her missionaries, and papal corruption is not to-day what it was in the sixteenth century. Twice has the visible Unity of the Catholic Church been broken, but the mutually alienated portions,—the Greek, the Latin and the Anglican—have preserved their common heritage of Faith and Order in spite of many evils. In fact, the corruptions of the Roman Curia have been urged as an argument for the presence of superhuman life in the Roman Communion, since that Communion has survived them and appears more vigorous than ever.

But *no portion* of the Church has given proofs of such indestructible vitality as has the

Anglican Communion<sup>1</sup>. The Historic Episcopate has existed in England since the second century, without interruption. The original British Church, however, was driven into Wales by the Anglo-Saxon invaders of the fifth and sixth centuries.

In 597, the work of converting these invaders commenced under St. Augustine, who was sent with forty monks by Pope Gregory I., and became the first Archbishop of Canterbury. Celtic missionaries from Iona aided the Romans in converting the northern parts; but, in 664, Roman usages were finally adopted, and under Theodore, consecrated by Pope Vitalian in 668 A. D., the English sees were filled with Bishops who traced their succession from S. Peter and his successors in the Roman see. The *Ecclesia Anglicana*, as it came to be called, completed its national organization under Theodore; and this organization preceded and made possible the political unity of England.

In those days, the Pope was looked up to by Anglicans with respect and gratitude; but, while he exercised great influence in England, that influence was moral simply. From the

1. See App. I.

time of William the Conqueror, however, claims to constitutional supremacy began to be urged. These claims were not admitted in theory; but, none the less, the papal power had become practically very excessive in England by the time of Henry III., and brought many evils in its train. Yet this supremacy was at no time legally or canonically acknowledged in England, but from time to time protested against as a usurpation. The ground taken then and at all times has been that which governed certain decisions of the First General Council of Nicea, 325 A. D., which places the local government of every geographical portion of the Universal Church under its own Bishops and the nearest Metropolitans. Statute after statute was passed against papal usurpation, but without permanent effect until the time of Henry VIII. Henry was a despot, whose enormities are known to all. Yet God overruled his iniquities and tyranny to the good of the English Church—*i. e.*, to the restoration of the ancient self-government of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*.

In abolishing the papal supremacy, Henry endeavoured to secure for himself an ecclesias-

tical supremacy equally absolute. But the Clergy refused—and they alone of Henry's subjects had the boldness to withstand his will—refused, I say, to acknowledge his supremacy until he consented to the words "So far as the law of Christ doth allow," and explained that no invasion of spiritual rights was contemplated, but merely a re-assertion of the ancient constitutional principle that the king is king of ecclesiastical persons as well as of secular ones<sup>1</sup>. In accordance with this independent attitude (too often misrepresented by popular writers), the ancient *Ecclesia Anglicana*, which antedates the very Kingdom of England itself, and to which that kingdom is indebted for its constitution and Magna Charta, began the work of reforming itself. No break of ecclesiastical continuity occurred; and, when Convocation declared, in 1534, that the Bishop of Rome hath not, according to the Scriptures, any greater jurisdiction in this realm of England by Divine right, than any other foreign Bishop, it simply fell back upon the opening sentence of Magna Charta, which declared that the *Ecclesia Anglicana* should be forever free; and

1. Dixon's Hist. Eng. Church; Vol. I. 57-68.

upon the ancient right of Bishops of the Catholic Church to govern within their own geographical jurisdictions on behalf of the universal Episcopate. Many ancient title deeds and statutes show the falsity of Macaulay's assertion that Henry VIII. founded the English Church. He merely delivered it from a usurped foreign tyranny.

Under Edward's regency, the Church's Synod was largely ignored, and consequently the more radical legislation of that reign concerning ecclesiastical matters was unconstitutional, and never came to life again after Mary's accession rendered it ineffective. Under Elizabeth the Reformation was renewed. She was despotic, but the Church acted through her own Synods. The Episcopate was perpetuated through Archbishop Parker, the validity of whose consecration has been acknowledged by the Roman historian Lingard, by the Romish Sorbonne of Paris, and by many eminent Roman theologians. The Prayer Book and Thirty-Nine Articles were put forth. These Articles were eirenical; and, for the sake of peace, adopted the forms of expression most likely to gain acceptance among the members of the Pu-

ritan faction already appearing. But Calvinism was carefully expurgated from the phrases employed. No other proof of this should be needed than the subsequent course of events. The Calvinists became more and more discontented; and, after failing in an attempt to secure an adoption of the Lambeth Articles, in 1595, drifted into non-conformity and dissent. On the other hand, those who remained attached to the Elizabethan settlement and were influenced by its atmosphere developed during the next generation into the Catholic School of Andrewes and Laud.

Meanwhile the Church came between two fires—the State and the Puritans. An unfortunate association of her interests with those of a tyrannical government—an association which came about by the personal and passing political mistakes of those in power, and was not a part of her official and doctrinal position at all—obscured her spiritual position, alienated the people to a great extent, and strengthened the hands of dissent. She was persecuted and driven into hiding places. Her services were proscribed and her Clergy were deprived of their means of subsistence and imprisoned

in plague-breeding hulks. The reaction came and brought its own evils—licentiousness and flippancy in high quarters. Dissent was naturally but barely allowed to exist, for the idea of physical toleration was not understood by any party as yet. In spite of all, however, the Church made rapid headway and had practically become the Church of nineteen-twentieths of the people by the time of James II., when seven of her Bishops immortalized themselves by resisting openly the popish manœuvres of that monarch. The revolution came, and William's reign fostered the development of rationalism—especially among the Bishops. He cared nothing for the Church's ancient position, and, without appreciating the real loyalty of the Non-jurors and the purely technical nature of their scruple as to taking the oath of renunciation of James II., deprived the Church of England at a blow of the very flower of her Ministry. The upper house of Convocation degenerated rapidly, therefore, and before the opening of the eighteenth century the two houses of that body were at war with each other. The Church's Synod was finally suspended by royal authority, in 1717, and not

allowed to meet again for the dispatch of business until 1852. The Church's enemies seemed to triumph, but the very completeness of their victory was God's means of preserving her ancient heritage and formularies amid the dreary chaos of Deism, high and dry--intensely dry -- Churchism, and non-sacramental low Churchism of the eighteenth century. No Convocation meant an unchanged Prayer Book, and Providence blinded the Church's enemies so that they did not complete their work by reviving and using the proper legal instrument for depraving her formularies.

The Sacraments fell into disuse under the cold indifference of a semi-deistic and erastian Episcopate; so that, when the inextinguishable life of the Church revived from below, it first exhibited itself on the non-sacramental, one-sided and emotional lines of the Evangelical Movement. The Wesleyan Movement--not formally schismatic during Wesley's life-time --maintained the regular use of the Sacraments, but broke away finally and lost its sacramental character when it lost the Episcopal Ministry.

But Evangelical zeal could not support itself without the foundations of Historic Christianity. Those foundations were still preserved and officially maintained in the Book of Common Prayer. Accordingly, when threats of disestablishment led to a closer examination of the Church's spiritual position, the Catholic movement of this century began in 1833;—a movement which no man has been able to check or control; which has affected the entire Anglican Communion; which has survived discouragements of dignitaries, consequent impatient and illogical movements Romeward, widespread panics resulting therefrom, hostile decisions of state-controlled courts, open persecution and the imprisonment of some of its leaders; and which now confronts the Christian world with the Book of Common Prayer in hand as its evidence that the Anglican Communion stands to-day as ever for the original of the Christian Religion—reformed of its mediæval accretions, indeed, but ever the same and “incapable of compromise or surrender.”

It is a marvellous history,—in which our American body shares. For one hundred and fifty years our only Bishop resided in London,

---

and even our ordinations took place three thousand miles across the sea. We finally secured an American Episcopate, but our local organization was attended with great peril. We were surrounded with hostile dissent, which enormously outnumbered us, and suspected of political disloyalty. The prevalent Deism had leavened the minds of some of our leading Clergy and rendered them careless as to fundamental verities. Yet no doctrinal changes in our formularies occurred. The Anglican Book of Common Prayer was adopted, with verbal revision, and a declaration inserted that "this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship; or further than local circumstances require." Somewhat timid at first, our Clergy and laity gathered courage as time went by, and discovered that their success in winning souls was in proportion to their definite assertion of the Church's historic position and clear proclamation of the truths which they had received. Since the Catholic revival has brought into clearer light the priceless treasures embodied in our Prayer Book, the Episcopal Church has exercised an

influence grotesquely out of proportion to her size, our opponents being judges.

Permit me to quote certain notable words, written over fifty years ago, which epitomize the post-reformation part of the history I have given. "If there ever were a Church on which the experiment has been tried, whether it had life or not, the English is that one . . . . It has endured in trouble and prosperity, under seduction and under oppression. It has been practised upon by theorists, brow-beaten by sophists, intimidated by princes, betrayed by false sons, laid waste by tyranny, corrupted by wealth, torn by schism and persecuted by fanaticism. Revolutions have come upon it sharply and suddenly, to and fro, hot and cold, as if to try what it was made of. It has been a sort of battlefield on which opposite principles have been tried. No opinion, however extreme, but may be found, as the Romanists are not slow to reproach us, among its Bishops and Divines. Yet what has been its career on the whole? . . . Lutherans have tended to Rationalism; Calvinists have become Socinians; but what has it become? As far as its formularies are concerned, it may be said all along to have grown

towards a more perfect Catholicism than that with which it started at the time of its estrangement . . . . In our own times temporal defences have been removed which the most strenuous political partisans of the Church considered essential to its well being, and the loss of which they deplored as the first steps towards its ruin. To their surprise . . . . they beheld what they thought a mere establishment, dependent on man to create and destroy, rise up and walk with a life of its own, such as it had before they and their constitution came into being<sup>1</sup>."

It is such a history that makes us so sure that the Episcopal Church stands for what is permanent in Christianity and incapable of compromise or surrender even by those of her Ministers who would undertake such treachery.

I am trying your patience, I know; but our points of view differ too widely for me to explain our position briefly, and I must clear up a few misconceptions before explaining the claim of the Episcopal Church to stand for the only possible basis of Church Unity.

1. British Critic of Jan. 1840, p. 77.

(a) It is said that the Episcopal claims cannot be proved by Biblical texts. Such an objection can only be urged by one who has failed to perceive the real nature of the Catholic position assumed by us; which is, as it has been the design of my paper to show, that of allegiance to a religion which we are convinced is *more ancient* than Holy Scripture, and which determines the point of view from which the different portions of the Bible were written. The Bible, therefore, is filled to bursting with this religion from end to end; but was written for the edification of those who *already adhered* to it rather than to explain its details to converts or to furnish an arsenal of proofs. We are not concerned, therefore, with chapter and verse—although by no means helpless in that direction—so much as with the uninterrupted pertinency of the entire Scriptures. Our Biblical proof is, we think, overwhelming; but it consists chiefly in this, that when the reader once acquires our *point of view*, many Biblical treasures are unlocked of which the dissenting world appears to have no inkling; and the connected harmony of the Sacred Volume as a whole flashes upon the mind in

dazzling splendour. If I can induce a man to read the Bible through devoutly and honestly, after mastering<sup>1</sup> the Catholic standpoint, I have no fears as to the result. The Bible never turned a properly trained Catholic into a Sec-tarian.

(b) Again, it may be objected that many eminent Episcopalians will not assent to the position which has been here set forth. That is true, and I acknowledge the fact that there are various schools of thought among Episco-palians which set forth opposing opinions. But true and lamentable as it is, it is entirely irrel-levant. I did not come here, my brethren, to represent the prevalent opinions of individuals, however eminent, or of schools, however exten-sive. I am exhibiting to the best of my ability what the *Church* stands for, which tolerates these schools without sanctioning them. I find this in her formularies and obligatory in-stitutions—embodied in the Book of Common Prayer. Let me illustrate: Should any Priest deny the Apostolic Succession, he may learn from the preface of the services for ordination,

1. I do not mean after *accepting* it, but after being able to assume it correctly for the purpose of argument.

that, even though the Church may refrain from disciplining him, she does not sanction his opinion. Does he deny the supernatural efficacy of priestly ministrations, let him remember that, when the Bishop made him Priest, he did so with the words, "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." Bishop Cheney discovered that the Church will not even tolerate a denial of infant regeneration by means of Baptism, when such denial leads to a mutilation of the Baptismal Service. Finally, if a Priest does not believe that the consecrated Eucharistic Elements are the Body and Blood of Christ, he must none the less teach his candidates for Confirmation a Catechism which says that the inward part of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is "The Body and Blood of Christ," and must administer the consecrated bread and wine with the words, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ," . . . . "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc.

I have tried to show historically that passing waves of opinion and of imperfect loyalty to the Church's ancient position, have not, in fact, altered that position. They cannot do so; and

it is because of this security—a security which rests upon Christ's promise and presence—that she can tolerate imperfect opinions with safety, and can refuse to quench a smoking flax by excluding an imperfect believer, until forced to do so by direct repudiation of her formularies, or mutilation of the rites in which her mind is exhibited. No man-made society can thus tolerate permanently within its midst what it cannot sanction, without going to pieces; but the Episcopal Church has done so for ages, and has not yet gone to pieces.

(c) What I have said should remove another misapprehension concerning the Episcopal Church. It is objected that Episcopalians do not, as a rule, live religiously or exhibit the fruits of the Spirit; and it is added, “By their fruits ye shall know them.” I am not going to deny the many imperfections of the average Churchman. I am but too well aware of them and of my own. And I am ready to admit that if you measure us individuals of average level by our fruits, we shall suffer severe judgment. But here again there is a misconception of what we claim to stand for. Let me explain.

Neither the Jewish nor the Christian dispensation constituted the Church to be an organization of the *righteous* who need no salvation, but rather to be the place in which and the means by which to *save sinners*. It is Christ Who likens His Kingdom to a drag-net which gathers in fish of every kind, and retains them, if possible, until the day of judgment. It is because we *are* so sinful and in need of sanctification that the Church gathers us in and retains us, that she may gradually leaven our corrupt hearts and minds, and save us. She disciplines us with tender love, but does not exclude us; since to do so is to deprive those whom God died to save of the means by which He ordains that His saving grace shall be applied to them. This saving work is life-long. There may be fall after fall, but even though repentance has to be repeated seventy times seven, Jesus Christ is ready in his Church to forgive and heal. For the Church to drive out the unspiritual would be for her to abandon her work of saving the world. Therefore, what you see of our imperfections, while it proves that we are not yet made perfect, also shows that the Church to

which we belong is a *Catholic* Church, ordained by Him Who came to seek and save that which was lost, and who refrained from excommunicating even when His disciple denied Him.

This Church is Holy—not because of its *earthly* membership, but because Jesus is its Head, the Holy Ghost is its animating spirit, and sanctification of souls is the ultimate result of its work.

(*d*) Again, it is said that our position is sacerdotalism pure and simple, and infringes upon the prerogatives of the only Mediator between God and Man<sup>1</sup>. And it is frequently added, if we were consistent we would submit to the Pope. Well, at the risk of being thought a disciple of anti-Christ, I must acknowledge that our position does mean sacerdotalism, pure and simple—although it does not involve the consequences which Protestants suppose. Sacerdotalism, properly understood, means a conviction that Christ exercises His Priesthood, which the Epistle to the Hebrews emphasizes so strongly, through a *Ministry* of His own appointment and empowering. We Priests are Priests because we are Christ's

1. I. Tim. II. 5.

instruments in performing on earth what He performs in glory above. We do not displace Him, but He uses us as His Ministers. The powers which we wield are official ones—not personal. We are nothing save by His appointment and presence. This Nation recently offered to mediate between China and Japan, but the offer was officially and *effectively* communicated through our Secretary of State. It would have been absurd on that account to interpret Judge Gresham's act as putting his own person between the United States and the Eastern Nations. It is the same with sacerdotalism. We are called Priests as the Ministers of the Great High Priest. Our ministry is with power, but with ministerial power simply. The only *personal* power which can come between the soul and God in the Catholic Church is that of Jesus Christ<sup>1</sup>.

As to submitting to the Pope, it would be logical, if logic required that in order to embrace a religious system consistently, one should also embrace every caricature of it and accretion to it which human craft may have invented. We look more like Romanists than

1. See App. IV.

Protestants, I admit; but would any one think that, because a cleansed portrait resembled a spattered one more than one which had been torn to shreds, it should therefore be spattered again as soon as possible! No, we hope that the spattered portrait will be cleaned, and that the one which has been torn will be reproduced from the original negative.

(e) Again, it is said that times change and the Catholic System is out of date. Christianity must adapt itself to new conditions. We can only reply that the Catholic System is Catholic because it *has* the capacity of adaptation to the most diverse conditions. Christ ordained the Church and her Ministry for all time, which he would not have done without perception beforehand of its Catholic elasticity. Moreover, since the Church is God's and not man's, it may not be modified in its original constitution save on Divine authority—an authority to which we lay no manner of claim.

---

### III.

After all that I have said I need not detain you long in explaining why we claim our posi-

tion to be *the only possible basis of Church Unity.*

That Church Unity must be attained if possible, cannot be doubted by any habitual and devout reader of Holy Scripture. Schism is there condemned in unsparing terms. In Old Testament days, for example, no amount of falling away in the Jewish Church was held to justify schism from it; and the same messages which in the New Testament denounce certain Churches for the wickedness prevailing in them speak with equally harsh terms of those who would create divisions in them<sup>1</sup>. Let me speak frankly. We think that the founders of modern Protestant sects did a huge wrong in fact, although we acquit them of *malice prepense*. It was their sad *mistake*, as I am sure they now recognize and deplore.

(a) There must be reunion; but the Unity which we ought to seek is a visible conformity of all Christians to that organism which Christ established, along with a healing of its internal dissensions. And this is our first reason for saying that the Episcopal Church stands for the only possible basis of Church Unity—be-

1. Hammond's *Christian Church, What is It?*

cause we are convinced that it stands for what Christ designed should be the permanent organization of His Church. Holy Scripture nowhere gives the slightest hint of Churches in the modern sense—*i. e.*, of Christian organisms differing in kind from each other and taking the place of each other in the same localities. The New Testament Churches are local apportionments of jurisdiction in one Universal Church, in which the same features of visible organization and sacramental life are repeated. When S. Paul spoke of “all the Churches” he did not have “denominations” in mind, but local congregations, obeying one Ministry, one Faith and one Sacramental System.

Gentlemen, we find it hard to understand or bear with each other on this subject. We are thought to unchurch the Protestant denominations. But it is a mistake to think so. Only God could unchurch anything, which once was a Church. We are indeed convinced that the Protestant denominations about us are not, as such, genuine Churches of the New Testament pattern—*i. e.*, organic parts of the Church of Christ, having its constitution and entitled to

the allegiance of its members. It is true, that we rather look upon them as mere *human societies*, differing *in kind* from anything which Christ planted, whose *very existence* is a sad mistake, since they withdraw the members of Christ from their allegiance to His Ministry and Sacraments. This is our conviction concerning the existing situation, but we neither caused the situation, nor do we rejoice in it. We cannot unchurch anything, but we have convictions as to what the Church is, in which Christ wills that men should serve under Him, and feel it our duty to proclaim what we are sure has been committed to us to proclaim. If we cannot agree in this, and if our disagreement affects our mutual relations and prevents us from having ecclesiastical fellowship with you, let us strive at least to refrain from mutual misapprehensions and to be convinced of each other's charity and honest desire to promote the welfare of mankind. Meanwhile, "The truth is mighty and will prevail." God speed the day, not of sacrificing religious convictions for the sake of deceptive externals of charity, but of such clear knowledge of the

truth by all loyal souls that charity will prevail because truth prevails.

(b) Another reason why the Episcopal Church claims to stand for the only possible basis of Church Unity is the fact that its Ministry and Sacraments did, as history shows, hold the Catholic Church together for many centuries, and that each departure from it has been the cause of schism.

Thus, the attempt of the Bishop of Rome to upset the Divinely ordained and constitutional equality of all Bishops in their respective jurisdictions, by the claim to rule in Christ's stead by Divine right over the whole Church Militant, caused a rupture of Communion between the East and West in the eleventh century, and between the Roman obedience and the Anglican Communion in the sixteenth century. The Eastern and Anglican Communions are now drawing towards each other in proportion to their greater familiarity with each other's adherence to the ancient paths; but we cannot, even for the sake of an appearance of Unity, sacrifice the Divinely ordained organization of Christ's Church. If Rome should reform herself, modify her attitude, and

permit the Apostolic Ministry to exercise its proper functions without interference, it might be, perhaps, that the Unity of the Church would be made more visible to the world by yielding to some one see—naturally to Rome—a precedence of honour among equals, a sort of convenient and limited presidency in matters subject to human control, such as was allowed in ancient days. If such a thing could be done without peril to religion and with increase of charity, no Churchman should desire to prevent it.

Again, the revolt from the historic Ministry and Sacraments, which occurred in the sixteenth century, has split Western Christendom into hundreds of fragments, and has greatly increased the causes of alienation which must be removed before all Christians can be in Communion and visible charity with each other.

These facts are indisputable and their significance appears plain to us—*i. e.*, that there is only one Ministry and Sacramental System, the loyal adherence to which has ever kept the Church of Christ in visible Unity. Our plea is, “Why try experiments?” Church Unity must be worked for; let us then make use of

the means which, as a matter of fact, has demonstrated its fitness for the use to which we would put it.

(c) Nor is this all of the matter. We are bound to consider, before adopting any plan for the restoration of visible unity, whether it is such as is likely to secure general co-operation. As some of our Bishops have been careful to point out, the only Church Unity with which we have a right to content ourselves must be world-wide. The entire Catholic world must be united before the dying prayer of Christ that His disciples might be one, can be answered.

Unless we refuse to Catholics generally the name Christian—which of course, we Episcopalians cannot do without changing convictions which lie at the root of our religious life—it is clear that over three-fourths of the entire Christian world must surrender convictions as well as preferences before any basis of unity will be available, other than what has been named by our Bishops, and for which the Episcopal Church has stood since a time which antedates the existence of Protestant denominations by many ages.

Is it not natural that we should appeal to history, under such circumstances, and say that, so far from the maintenance of the Historic Episcopate and Catholic Religion being a barrier to Unity, it is the modern rejection of it which must be repaired before any Unity is possible which God will bless?

I have but little more to say. I have done my best to enable you to understand us. I have not concealed anything for the sake of appearance of an agreement which does not exist; but, at the same time, have tried to put you in a position to see that our inability to co-operate in religious matters with you is not caused by bitterness of spirit, but by the conviction that we have received our religious system from God, for sure maintenance and propagation among all men; and that we cannot, without a breach of trust for which God will hold us to strict account, even *seem* to acknowledge any substitute as lawful, however sure we may feel that its adherents are sincere in their mistake and for that reason blameless. We do not judge Protestants. We give them credit for good faith. But we believe that it makes a vast difference to *mankind* whether

the Catholic Religion prevails or not. That it will prevail we have no manner of doubt. Thus we rest our case.

The securing of Church Unity seems, for the present at least, beyond human power. Yet we cannot believe that Christ's prayer is to remain unanswered to the end. What man cannot achieve, God can bring to pass. Ah! my brothers, let us trust in Him and be patient. All human things pass away. God alone and His Religion is immutable. Believers may have to endure persecution yet; and persecution, when overruled by God, is able to purify what is corrupt, and make age-long misconceptions and alienations disappear. We might welcome such a persecution, and in the power of united zeal and grace take the gates of heaven by storm.

O LORD JESUS CHRIST WHO SAIDST UNTO THY DISCIPLES, PEACE I LEAVE WITH YOU, MY PEACE I GIVE UNTO YOU; REGARD NOT OUR SINS, BUT THE FAITH OF THY CHURCH; AND GRANT HER THAT PEACE AND UNITY WHICH IS AGREEABLE TO THY WILL, WHO LIVEST AND REIGNEST GOD, FOREVER AND EVER. AMEN.

## APPENDIX I.

I give a brief list of suitable works for the benefit of those who wish to study the subjects treated of in this paper.

## THE CHURCH.

Hammond's Christian Church, What is It? Oxford, 1894; 65 cents.

Gore's Mission of the Church; \$1.00.

Palmer on the Church of Christ; 2 vols. London, 1839.

## THE MINISTRY.

Lightfoot on the Christian Ministry. (In the "Dissertations on the Apostolic Age," with appendix.) London, 1893. Pub. separately, New York; 70 cents.

Haddan's Apostolical Succession in the Church of England. London, 1883.

Gore's Ministry of the Christian Church. New York, 1889; \$3.00.

## THE SACRAMENTS.

Sadler's Church Doctrine Bible Truth. New York, 1882; 50 cents.

Sadler's Second Adam and the New Birth. New York, 1869; \$1.25.

Sadler's One Offering. London, 1889; 75 cents.

Prynne's Truth and Reality of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Longmans, 1894; \$1.25.

Wilberforce's Holy Eucharist. New York, 1885; \$2.50.

## HISTORICAL.

Lane's Illustrated Notes on English Church History. New York, 1887; 2 vols., 40 cents per vol.

Hore's History of the Church of England. New York, 1893.

Aubrey Moore's History of the Reformation. London, 1890.

Blunt's History of the English Reformation.

Wilberforce's History of the American Church.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

Ewer's Catholicity, Protestantism and Romanism. New York; \$1.50.

Ewer's Failure of Protestantism. New York, 1869.

Hammond's Church or Chapel; An Eirenicon. London.

Hammond's English Nonconformity and Christ's Christianity. London.

Little's Reasons for Being a Churchman. Milwaukee, 1885; \$1.10.

Forbes on The Thirty-Nine Articles. Oxford, 1881; \$3.00.

Hall's Theological Outlines. Milwaukee; see adv.

Staley's Catholic Religion. Oxford, 1894; 30 cents up.

Westcott's Bible in the Church. London and New York; \$1.25.

The above works can be secured through The Young Churchman Company, Milwaukee, Wis.

## APPENDIX II.

Churchmen need not be disturbed by the results of Biblical criticism, however unexpected, for the strength of their belief in the supernatural and plenary inspiration of the Bible depends—not upon the dates or authorships of its several portions, but—upon the general trustworthiness of the religious history which the Scriptures contain, and the success with which they can be employed to irradiate and confirm the doctrines, institutions and practical principles of the religion historically established and perpetuated in the world by God.

## APPENDIX III.

It may be urged that the question at issue is—not what view of the Episcopate this Church stands for, but—whether she will, for the sake of Unity, tolerate other and less advanced views on the part of those who agree to yield obedience to the Episcopate, in fact. The proper answer to this question is clear. The Church does, as we shall show later on,

tolerate views which she regards as imperfect, when an exercise of discipline would quench a smoking flax and do more harm than good. But there is an important limitation to this. She cannot sanction error; and, therefore, whatever she may overlook in dealing with individual cases, she cannot permit error *officially*, or recognize that it is lawful for any one, especially for one who seeks entrance to her Ministry, to hold views inconsistent with her own teaching. The Church teaches that her Ministry is Divinely instituted and possesses exclusive mission. She cannot rightly, therefore, enter into any *concordat* which leaves the parties who accept it free to enter her Ministry without accepting this, her teaching. Nor can she rightly acquiesce in any form of toleration of error on a scale so extensive as to imperil the official maintenance of her mind on the questions at issue.

#### APPENDIX IV.

It is said that Sacerdotalism is not contained in the New Testament, and that Christian Ministers are nowhere called Priests in the Bible. We hold, on the contrary, that the New Testa-

ment is full of Sacerdotalism, and that the absence of the title Priest, as applied to Christian Ministers, can be accounted for without taking non-sacerdotal ground.

The Jewish and Christian dispensations overlapped each other by Divine arrangement, apparently in order that the unalterable principles of the Old dispensation might be assimilated by the primitive disciples of the New, and successfully transplanted to the Christian Church. The Christian Church was conceived in the womb of Judaism. The New Testament is the product chiefly of the period of overlapping, when the Jewish Christians were obliged to obey both dispensations at once; and we read that "a great company of the [Jewish] Priests were obedient to the Faith" (Acts, VI. 7). To have applied the title Priest to Christian Ministers under such conditions would have been confusing in the extreme. But that the Christian dispensation was to be a sacerdotal one is clearly implied in what S. Peter says (I. Pet. II. 9), "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood," etc., and in what the epistle to the Hebrews (XIII. 10) says, "We have an altar," etc.

We have been insisting that the Christian dispensation is not the result of a revolt from Judaism (if it were, the permanent nature of the promises to Abraham and to Jerusalem would be destroyed and the Divine immutability intrenched upon), but an effective performance and continual application to the souls of men of what Judaism merely prefigured. This contention involves that the Sacerdotalism, which is so essential a part of the Old dispensation, should not be abolished in the Christian dispensation, but should be made more effective, and modified in detail merely, to meet the conditions resulting from the death of Christ and His entrance within the veil.

When the time drew near for completing the transition from the Old to the New, by the destruction of Jerusalem, the author of the epistle to the Hebrews was inspired to give a clear exposition of the eternal Priesthood of Christ, ordained of God (Chap. V.) to take the place of the merely typical priesthood of Aaron (Chap. VIII). Thus the New Covenant was clearly shown to be sacerdotal, and, by reason of its effectiveness, fitted to take the place of what was ineffective and preparatory merely.

The new Sacerdotalism is effective because it is the Sacerdotalism of Christ, Who has overcome death, and entered the true Holy of Holies.

Now, and this is a crisis in our argument, whatever Christ was sent forth to be in the world, that He sent forth His Apostolic Ministry to perpetuate on earth in His Name. "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth" (S. Matt. XXVIII. 18). "And behold, I send the promise of My father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high" (S. Luke XXIV. 49). "As My Father hath sent Me (cf. Heb. V. 4-6) even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained" (S. John XX. 21-23).

In view of all this, we believe that the thing signified by the term Priest is an essential part of the Christian dispensation as portrayed in the New Testament: that Christian Ministers on earth are Priests by participation in Christ's Priesthood: that their priesthood is

---

not personally inherent in themselves, but ministerial simply—*i. e.*, Christ's Priesthood, exercised by a Ministry of His own appointment: that they have power (although official and not personal) to remit sins—a sacerdotal power.

The overlapping of dispensations made it necessary for a time to use distinct names; but when Judaism passed away, the sacerdotal character of the Christian Ministry stood out in bold relief, and the title Priest, as applied to the offerer of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, came into inevitable use.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

## THEOLOGICAL OUTLINES.

---

A Series of concise and accurate Theological Propositions, covering the whole field of Dogmatic Theology, from the Anglo-Catholic point of view, with abundant references under each head.

Vol. I.—The Doctrine of God. 50 cents net.

Vol. II.—The Doctrine of Man and of the God-man. 75 cents net.

Vol. III.—The Doctrine of the Church and of Last Things; will appear in May, 1895.

The Trinity (N. Y.) Record says of Vol. II, that under its heads "is arranged a singularly compact, clear and strong instruction in Positive Dogmatics, soundly Catholic, and supported at every point by a highly useful array of authorities, Scriptural and other. The far-reaching brevity of this book would make it a very valuable manual for laymen, and we are compelled to add, for some of the clergy also. The style is luminous."

---

PUBLISHED BY THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.,  
MILWAUKEE, WIS.







Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01035 4548